

GENERAL LIBRARY
MAR 4 1922
UNIV OF MICH

The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Mondays, except in weeks in which there is a legal or a School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.

Entered as second-class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918.

VOL. XV, No. 17

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1922

WHOLE No. 413

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY STUDIES IN CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Edited by the Department of Greek and Latin

The Satire of Seneca on the Apotheosis of Claudius, commonly called the *Ἀποκολοκύν-
τως*. A Study. By ALLAN PERLEY BALL, Ph.D. 12mo, cloth, pp. vii + 256.
\$1.50 net.

The Stress Accent in Latin Poetry. By ELIZABETH HICKMAN DU BOIS, Ph.D.
12mo, cloth, pp. v + 96. \$1.50 net.

Studies in the Philosophical Terminology of Lucretius and Cicero. By KATHARINE
C. REILEY, Ph.D. 12mo, cloth, pp. ix + 133. \$1.50 net.

Costume in Roman Comedy. By CATHARINE SAUNDERS, Ph.D. 12mo, cloth,
pp. x + 145. \$1.50 net.

De Infinitivi Finalis vel Consecutivi Constructione apud Priscos Poetas Graecos.
By CHARLES JONES OGDEN, Ph.D. 8vo, cloth, pp. 65. \$1.25 net.

The Bellum Civile of Petronius. By FLORENCE T. BALDWIN, Ph.D. 12mo, cloth,
pp. viii + 264. \$1.50 net.

Religious Cults Associated with the Amazons. By FLORENCE MARY BENNETT,
Ph.D. 8vo, pp. ix + 79. paper, \$1.25 net; Cloth, \$1.50 net.

A Study of Archaism in Euripides. By CLARENCE AUGUSTUS MANNING, Ph.D. 8vo,
cloth, pp. xi + 98. \$1.50 net.

Studies in Magic from Latin Literature. By EUGENE TAVENNER, Ph.D. 8vo,
cloth, pp. x + 155. \$1.50 net.

Prolegomena to an Edition of the Works of Decimus Magnus Ausonius. By SISTER
MARIE JOSE BYRNE, Ph.D. 8vo, cloth, pp. viii + 101. \$1.50 net.

The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy. By WILLIAM STUART MESSER, Ph.D.
8vo, cloth, pp. ix + 105. \$1.75 net.

Women in Attic Inscriptions. By HELEN A. McCLEES, Ph.D. 8vo, paper, pp.
iv + 51. \$1.00 net.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
NEW YORK CITY

Prescribed for College Entrance 1923-1924-1925 OVID

THE Gleason edition stands alone in its suitability for this work in the secondary schools. The selections are those which have proved most enjoyable to boys and girls. They afford easy reading in verse and acquaint the student with the legends of the gods and heroes of Greek and Roman mythology.

The first hundred lines are divided into feet for scansion, with the accents and caesuras marked. Each selection is accompanied by notes with introduction and summary and references to English reading.

Gleason's A Term of Ovid

*By Clarence W. Gleason, A. M., Master of Greek and Latin, Roxbury Latin School,
Boston. Cloth 12mo., 232 Pages, with notes, vocabulary, and illustrations.*

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

READINGS IN GREEK HISTORY

By I. C. THALLON, *Vassar College*

The period from Homer through the battle of Chaeronea is fully covered in this collection of extracts translated from the primary sources of Greek history.

Compiled with the special object of being serviceable in Secondary Schools and in undergraduate College courses, the volume supplies reading which has not hitherto been available for those unacquainted with Greek.

GINN AND COMPANY,
70 Fifth Avenue, New York

The Classical Weekly

VOL. XV, No. 17

MONDAY, MARCH 6, 1922

WHOLE No. 413

A POSSIBLE SOURCE OF THE DREAM IN PINDAR'S FOURTH PYTHIAN

An examination of the field of imaginative Greek literature, apart from the lyric, shows that the dream as a literary motive is of fairly frequent occurrence. In the *Iliad*, the poet, starting diffidently, experimented once in the use of this device as an essential element of the plot. In the *Odyssey* he introduced the dream more often to perform this function, and the structure of the dream exhibits certain advances in technique. This is not the only rôle played by the dream in the epic, for practically all the forms of the dream discoverable in later literature are found in embryo here¹. With the great writers of tragedy the dream has already become a tradition and is freely introduced, apparently without reference to its existence in the original myth². The structure of the dream as employed by these writers is consequently more complex—the allegorical form is the rule in tragedy³—and usually more effective. When we pass from narrative in verse to narrative in prose, and particularly to the elegant and artistic prose which did service as history, such as that of Herodotus and Plutarch⁴, we discover that the introduction of the dream is now a stock convention, so that the crisis of an action is almost invariably attended by the relation of a pertinent dream.

Greek lyric, on the other hand, as one might expect, rarely employs the device of the dream⁵. For lyric poetry does not, in the main, draw its interest from narration, but from the personal, subjective passion with which the poet portrays his thought. The traditional devices of artistic narration—among them

¹The passages in Homer in which dreams are used for motivating the action or in which reference is made to dream-phenomena are as follows: *Iliad* 2.1 ff., 10.496-497, 22.199-200, 23.62-107; *Odyssey* 4.787-841, 6.13-51, 11.207, 222, 14.495, 19.509-581, 20.61-90, 24.12, 21.79 (identical with 19.581).

²For the support of this statement and others found in this paper the reader may consult the author's dissertation, *The Dream in Homer and Greek Tragedy*, published by the Columbia University Press, 1918 (referred to below as *Dissertation*). See *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 12, 155-157. The footnotes of this work afforded a means of making accessible certain information about the dream not elsewhere collected.

³In the epic the dream is, as a rule, conceived of as straightforward, external, objective, existing outside of the dreamer. Such dreams are found in all the longer passages cited above (footnote 1), except *Odyssey* 19.509-581.

⁴Compare Herodotus 1.33-45, 107 ff., 209; 2.139, 141, 152; 3.30, 65, 124; 5.55, 56, 62; 6.107, 131; 7.12-19, 48; 8.54; Plutarch, *Agamemnon* 6; *Alcibiades* 39; *Alexander* 2, 18, 24, 26, 41, 50; *Antonius* 22; *Aristides* 11, 19; *Brutus* 20, 41; *Caesar* 32, 42, 63, 68; *Cimon* 18; *Cicero* 44; *Cleomenes* 7; *Coriolanus* 24; *Crassus* 12; *Demosthenes* 19, 29; *C. Gracchus* 7; *Eumenes* 6; *Lucullus* 10, 12; *Pelopidas* 20-22; *Pericles* 3; *Pompeius* 23, 68, 73; *Pyrrhus* 11, 29; *Sulla* 6, 28; *Themistocles* 26, 30.

⁵The dream discussed in this paper, Pindar, *Pyth.* 4.70-257, is the only dream which the lyric relates at any length. Stesichorus, in the *Oresteia* fragment (42, ed. Bergk), portrays Agamemnon as appearing in a dream in the form of a serpent showing on its head wounds from Clytemnestra's ax. Just what the relation of this dream was to the original poem we have no means of determining. Sappho (Frag. 87) is equally tantalizing.

the device of the dream—are, therefore, lacking, except where, as in the odes of Pindar, the poet turns aside from the purely lyrical conception of his art to tell a story.

The Fourth Pythian is the most epic of Pindar's odes, and the occurrence of the dream in it is natural in a work so largely narrative. Here only does the poet use this device to motivate the action. A comparison of this unique instance of the dream with the dreams in the tragedies of his great contemporary Aeschylus suggests a possible source for this dream in Pindar. I refer particularly to the *Persians* and the *Prometheus*. The interest in these three works lies in the use of the dream as a part of the machinery of the action and in the internal similarity of the dreams involved.

In the *Persians*, 176 ff., the queen mother, Atossa, declares that she has been troubled by evil dreams ever since the departure of her son, Xerxes, for Greece. One more vivid than all the others has come to her in the night before the action of the play begins. This she tells to the chorus.

'Two women of heroic size appeared before her. Though sisters, they dwelt apart, and were dressed, one in Persian, the other in Dorian attire. As they fell into a quarrel, Xerxes yoked them to his chariot. The Persian willingly performed her task, but the Dorian tore the harness in pieces, dragged the chariot madly along, splintered the yoke, and threw Xerxes to the ground. As he fell, the figure of his father, Darius, stood beside him, commiserating him. When Xerxes saw his father, he rent his clothes'.

The evil forebodings of this dream are heightened and confirmed by an omen which Atossa beholds upon arising. An eagle flies for refuge to the altar of Apollo, closely pursued by a hawk which keeps plucking at its head. The eagle represents Xerxes and the hawk the Greeks. The action of the scenes which follow is forecast and determined by the dream: it prepares for the messenger of disaster who enters immediately after (249) and tells the tale of Salamis and of Xerxes's retreat. The dream dominates the structure of the plot⁶.

In the *Prometheus*, 640 ff., Io relates the dream which has harassed her nightly, bidding her to go forth from her father's house to become the mistress of Zeus. This dream, on inquiry by frequent messengers to Pytho and Dodona, is at last confirmed by a clear charge from the oracle of Apollo that Io should be thrust from her home by her father. In her wanderings consequent to this command Io comes to the rock to which Prometheus is fettered, and the well-known Io

⁶See the statements in P. Richter, *Zur Dramaturgie des "Aeschylus"*, 89 (Leipzig, 1892), and in Wilamowitz, *Die Perser des Aeschylus*, Hermes 32.386.

episode ensues. It will be seen that the influence of this dream upon the action, or what takes the place of action—"a never-changing tableau" where "gradation of portraiture takes the place of dramatic progression"—is less noteworthy than that of the dream in the Persians⁷.

In the Fourth Pythian, Jason has come to Iolcus and without anger has claimed the throne from the usurper, Pelias. Pelias, too, has learned the wisdom of gentle, wily words. He will do all the youthful hero wishes. But Pelias is old, while with Jason the flower of his youth is still burgeoning. Perhaps he will use his strength to allay the passion of the chthonic divinities which has been made known to Pelias in dreams.

'For Phrixus orders some to come to Aetes's dwelling and summon home his spirit⁸; to bring back the hide of the ram, thick-fleeced, which in time of yore saved him from the waves of the sea and from a stepmother's unholy darts. Such marvellous things the dream voices'.

But dreams were not always to be trusted. As Penelope had seen (*Odyssey* 19.562-567), there were two gates of fleeting dreams, one of horn through which come true dreams, the other of ivory, the passage-way of deceitful dreams.

'So I have consulted the oracle at Castalia, whether there is aught to be searched out. In reply Apollo urges upon me as soon as may be a "ship-home-bringing" for Phrixus's soul⁹. This task do thou with right good will accomplish. And if thou dost, to thee will I surrender monarch's scepter and royal power. I swear it. Be Zeus, our common ancestor, the powerful witness to our oath'.

Jason and Pelias solemnize the compact and the young hero sends far and wide the heralds to announce the voyage. The expedition is the main action of the story and again the dream is the artifice for its introduction.

From these brief summaries we may observe that the three dreams exhibit certain details of importance to this study. Of the two dreams from Aeschylus, the one in the Persians follows the usual convention of tragedy in being allegorical; while the dream of the Prometheus, though demanding interpretation, is more direct. The relative importance of the two dreams differs: in the Persians the dream dominates the development of the plot; in the Prometheus it performs a highly essential, but still subordinate function in motivating the Io episode. The exact device in the Persians is dream and confirming portent¹⁰.

⁷I have made an appraisal of the value of the Io episode, *Dissertation* 66. There I have given references to the statements of others.

⁸Two possible imitations of the Iliad should be noted here. The dream is sent to a man, as always in the Iliad; the convention is that the dream should come to a woman. Secondly, in Iliad 23.72, Patroclus makes a somewhat similar request in his desire for burial so that he may enter Hades.

⁹The reference is to the ἀράκησις. Those who died in foreign lands were thrice addressed by name, whereupon the soul of the dead followed the caller home and found rest in a cenotaph (*P. Metzger, Pindars Siegeslieder*, 213).

¹⁰The epic poet could gain credence for his dream by portraying Zeus in the act of sending Oneiros to Agamemnon (*Iliad* 2.1-47), or by making Athene go in disguise to Nausicaa (*Odyssey* 6.13-51). The dramatic poet, working in a different department, would infrequently resort to so naive a device, and was forced to gain his hearers' belief through some substitute for the Homeric machinery. The confirming portent and the confirming oracle are part of this machinery.

For this device there is substituted in the Prometheus the dream followed by a clear-speaking oracle which interprets the mandatory clause of the dream. The dream of the Fourth Pythian resembles that of the Persians in having the same significance in relation to the plot: it is the main factor in the motivation of the Argonautic story. In all other pertinent features its kinship is with the dream of the Prometheus. Both are direct, non-allegorical, following herein the usual convention of the epic. Secondly, the full device used in the Persians is dream plus confirming omen, while the Prometheus and the Fourth Pythian display a mandatory dream, the demand and meaning of which are clarified and confirmed by the oracle of the god to whom it is referred, the god in both cases being Apollo.

Let us turn at this point to the situation in the literary world at the time when Pindar composed the Fourth Pythian, and see whether there is not some additional plausibility on this score for the suggestion that Aeschylus was the source of the dream under discussion.

In the history of Hellas there had been to the minds of the Greeks three supreme conflicts: the Argonautic expedition, the Trojan war, and the struggle with Persia. To the ancient Greek each of these great national tales was essentially historical¹¹. One of them, the struggle against Troy, Homer had glorified for all time. The Persian Wars had been sung by Aeschylus, veteran of Marathon and Salamis, against whose loyalty no hint of suspicion could be entertained. These two national themes, especially the latter, were closed to Pindar. There remained, however, that tale which antedated the Trojan war and which was scarcely less important, a tale which Homer speaks of as universally familiar, the Argonautic expedition¹². May it not be that Pindar, in the Fourth Pythian, using the victory of Arkesilas as a pretext, and feeling Boeotian kinship with the Minyae, attempted poetical atonement for his city's lukewarm loyalty—if not active Medism—by directing attention to this third tale of how united Greece took part in an expedition of glorious adventure¹³? What more natural, also, than that he should use some of the machinery suggested by his great forerunner and by his great contemporary? Homer had used the dream as an aid in unfolding the story of his epics on the Trojan war. The Persians, dealing with the second of these great national struggles, finds the chief source of its action in a dream. The introduction of the dream in this position of impelling importance must have captivated

¹¹No definite dividing line was drawn between myth and history, as even the most casual reader of Herodotus and of Strabo will recall. Further comment on this point may be found in Ribbeck, *Rheinisches Museum* 30.145, and in Patin, *Eschyle* 210 f.

¹²Iliad 7.467 ff., 21.41, 23.747; *Odyssey* 12.60 ff. It had started as a local myth: the Minyae were originally the Orchomenian followers of Jason. But, as Greece nationalized the myth and each city contributed her quota of imaginary heroes, the Minyae were transformed into that conglomerate crew of which the legend tells, drawn from all corners of the Hellenic world.

¹³The reader will recall that Pindar, grown older—he was sixty at the time of the composition of the Fourth Pythian—and with his patriotism broadened, praised Athens in the famous words of Fragment 76 (Schroeder), for which the Thebans fined him a thousand drachmae.

the imagination of the generation of Greeks which had experienced the tragedy of the conflict with Xerxes. It is hardly possible that this device in the Persians could have escaped the notice of a contemporary who could easily control all the artistic literature of his day. And even this possibility dwindles when we recall that Aeschylus presented the Persians a second time at the court of Hiero while Pindar was enjoying the hospitality of that prince. The evidence adduced by others proves almost beyond cavil that Aeschylus and Pindar derived mutual benefit from each other's work¹⁴. It would seem quite plausible, consequently, that Pindar, sharing the enthusiasm of his fellow-Greeks for the felicitous use of the dream-device in the Persians (however little one of his serenity may have sympathized with the full measure of their hatred of Persia) should take therefrom the suggestion for the use of the dream to motivate his lyric narrative upon the third great national theme.

The date of the Persians can be set with approximate certainty for the year 472 B. C.; the archon's name in the hypothesis, accepted as genuinely dating the play, establishes the year. The Fourth Pythian was written ten years later to commemorate the Pythian victory won by Arkesilas IV, king of Cyrene, in 462 B. C. Any argument that can be legitimately based on priority of time would therefore seem defensible.

The date of the Prometheus is not so easily determinable. The didascaliae do not give the archon's name, and, consequently, the range of conjecture has stretched from the early period of the writer's work to the last years of his poetical activity. But, as the result of the impressive cumulative evidence of many studies, a gradual crystallization of scholarly opinion has taken place, which dates the Prometheus between the appearance of the Persians, in 472, and the appearance of the Septem, in 468. If these chronological decisions are tenable, the Fourth Pythian is later than either of the plays of Aeschylus.

Any inferences in such a study as this can rest only upon conjecture. That we must look for the source of such a dream, not in religion and cult, but in the literature, I have elsewhere demonstrated¹⁵. Either writer may have invented the form or may have taken it from some common source in works which have not been preserved. But here, as elsewhere, speculation is forced back upon the factors which can be controlled, to wit, the extant literature. On this basis, then, the probabilities seem to be that Aeschylus used the dream to motivate the Persians, which dealt with one of the great national themes, taking the suggestion from the epic. From the device used here, i. e. dream and confirming omen, the step was short to

the device of the Prometheus, namely, dream and confirming oracle. This change was made by Aeschylus to give greater definiteness to a dream mandate in a situation essentially different from the situation in the Persians. His proneness to innovation and the great originality of his genius make it unnecessary to assume any source for the dream of the Prometheus outside of his own works. Pindar, writing later than Aeschylus, and also on a national theme, received from the Persians the idea of using the dream in a large way as an important element in the motivation of the Argonautic tale. But, finding the device of dream and mandatory oracle of the Prometheus more suited to his needs and ready to his hand, he adopted this particular framework for the structure of the Fourth Pythian¹⁶.

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

WILLIAM STUART MESSER

REVIEWS

Greek Tragedy. By Gilbert Norwood. Boston: John W. Luce and Company (1920). Pp. vi + 394.

Greek scholarship is showing many signs of life to-day. Interest, as indicated by recent publications, has a special bent toward the Greek tragedy. The last year has seen a monumental edition of the Oedipus Tyrannus. Professor Gilbert Murray has added to his annotated translations one of the Agamemnon. Before us is a useful work designed to cover the whole domain of Greek tragedy, both for classical students and for general readers. Professor Norwood holds that the satisfaction of those possessed of little or no knowledge of Greek is at least as important to-day as the meeting of the needs of scholars, in view of wide interest in Greek drama and in the drama in general. He has well accomplished his object. His knowledge is thorough; the advantage over earlier works afforded by the wealth of recent discoveries is grasped. The newer facts and theories may here be found. In controversial matters, the writing is usually careful, stating fully, with due emphasis, the arguments on both sides. The vexed question of the raised stage affords an excellent illustration of the usual treatment. The arguments are well given in outline; the author is obviously of the belief that there was no stage, high or low, but frankly admits that decision is difficult, and will probably be largely subjective.

Direct references to earlier writers are rather few. But Professor Norwood knows the field; he has made full use of the work of his predecessors and contemporaries, without being subject to any. He shows especial indebtedness to Jebb, Verrall, Murray, Haigh, and Wilamowitz-Moellendorf. We miss fuller recognition of Professor Tucker's fruitful studies; only twice is he cited, and only in connection with the

¹⁴The paths of the two poets in literature frequently crossed and the references of one to the other have often been noted. Both describe Aetna in eruption in passages in which some connection is manifest (Pythian 1.30-50; Prometheus 367-388). Aeschylus composed for the Syracusan stage the Aitnaia to glorify—as did Pindar in Pythian 1—the newly-founded city of Aetna. The Agamemnon recchoes Pindar's narrative of the grewsome deed of Clytemnestra in Pythian 11.16-37. Christ, *Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur*, Erster Teil, 283, entertains the conjecture that Pythian 4.291 alludes to the Prometheus trilogy but characterizes it as "sehr unsicher".

¹⁵Dissertation 57-58.

¹⁶As I have remarked previously (note 10), the device of dream plus mandatory oracle is probably suggested by restrictions of the medium in which Aeschylus is writing. No such restrictions conditioned the form of the dream in the epic-lyric of Pindar. The fact that Pindar has chosen to cast the meeting between Jason and Pelias in the dramatic form and adopt the dramatic machinery makes more plausible the theory that he fashioned the dream of Pelias after that of the Prometheus.

Suppliants. Of Headlam's fragmentary, but learned, work on the Agamemnon, we find no citation. The Croisets are almost unnoticed, except for the arrangements of the actors' parts in various plays. Professor Norwood has evidently, like all others who have become really acquainted with Verrall's work, been greatly stimulated by him. Yet he has retained his independence of judgment. Verrall's theory of the Ion is practically accepted; of the Alcestis, rejected; of the Agamemnon, to our regret, held as probably correct.

One of the interesting and unusual features of this book is the account of early and minor tragedians, in Chapter I, The Literary History of the Greek Tragedy. Though little, in volume, can be said of most of these, they cease, in Professor Norwood's book, to be mere names. As elsewhere, the author shows himself wisely heedful of the interest of the reader, in his use of anecdotes of the Greek theatrical world. Many students will be arrested by the relation of the religious utterances of the leader of the Thirty Tyrants, and by the aphorism, 'Tyranny is the mother of injustice', from a tragedy of Dionysius the Elder!, and, from the same writer, 'Alas! Alas! a useful wife I've lost!'. The account, in the same chapter, of Aristotle's Poetics, is very short. Wilamowitz-Moellendorf is quoted with approval, to the effect that Aristotle is of importance for us, not mainly on the aesthetic side, but on the historical. In the latter aspect, he must, it is said, be regarded by us as of final authority.

In Chapter II, besides the discussion of the stage-question, the reader will find a good description of the production of plays and an exceptionally full discussion of the mounting of a tragedy. The account of the scenery and apparatus is reasonable and undogmatic. As an instance of characteristic sobriety and thoughtfulness of treatment, Professor Norwood's words on the music and the actors deserve high praise. Note this passage:

The music itself is a subject complicated and obscure. Practically none of it has survived, and the details are naturally difficult to determine; but some main facts are clear. Though there was much singing and dancing, the music composed by the tragedians was vastly more simple than that of a modern opera. All choral singing was in unison, and as a rule the words dominated the music. The result was that an audience followed the language of an ode with ease, nor is it likely that such lyrics as those of the *Agamemnon* or the *Colonus*, not to mention many others, which are masterpieces of literature, would have been written were they fated to be drowned by elaborate music.

Professor Norwood accepts the prevailing theory of the number of actors, while admitting the Oedipus at Colonus as an exception. He admits, also, that occasionally very small speaking-parts were given to another performer. The use of a second chorus he limits, decidedly, to a few plays and to short scenes. The limitation of the number of actors, it is pointed out, led to excellent playing of the minor parts. The simplicity of the tragedy is held to be a result of the poets' deliberate choice. On the dignity of the

actors' profession in ancient Athens, so far above that in Rome or in the modern world, which rose from the religious character of Greek drama, it is a temptation to quote at length. Professor Norwood combats the story that Sophocles increased the size of the chorus from twelve to fifteen; he believes, rather, that, from the beginning of Aeschylus's career to the end of Sophocles's, the number gradually declined from fifty to fifteen. However, definite evidence, hard to brush away, points to a chorus of twelve in the latest works of Aeschylus. Many other matters are treated in this chapter, for which the reviewer gladly sends readers to the book itself.

The least satisfactory chapter is that on Aeschylus (Chapter III). Nine tenths of this chapter are fine and helpful. Yet the failure to recognize fully the worth and the beauty of the greatest of the three dramatists, one of the four or five supreme poets of the world, though it appears only in a few occasional phrases or sentences, is a regrettable feature of a work intended for general enlightenment and stimulation. In the main, this fault is confined to the criticism of the Suppliants. Poets have marveled at the beauty of this play. It is right to protest against a statement, in a work for popular use, that "the only really fine passages are those portions of the lyrics which bear the impress of the poet's masculine and profound theology". The author does, indeed, try to explain and mitigate this astonishing pronouncement. But the paragraph is not adapted to increase the study of a beautiful and too little known drama. The account of the Suppliants is balanced in part by an eloquent discussion of the Prometheus Bound, evidently written *con amore*. Professor Norwood holds the older view of the position of the Prometheus Bound in its trilogy, and believes it to be the latest, except the Oresteia, of the extant dramas. The reasons for these conclusions are given briefly, but sufficiently for the purposes of the work. We regret Professor Norwood's approval of Verrall's theory of the plot of the Agamemnon. He admits, in a footnote twenty-four pages later, that it seems to be accepted only by a minority. The Croisets, and Professor Murray (in his translation), do not notice it. Professor Tucker, apparently, rejects it. The theory has technical difficulties. As Verrall himself sees an interval in the Choephoroi, and suggests a departure of the chorus to mark it, his followers can not consistently object to this treatment of the Agamemnon, which preserves the essence of the tradition and keeps unimpaired the grandeur of the first part of the tragedy. Perhaps not even this device is needed. Surely it is strange to say, as Professor Norwood does in his Preface, that the difficulty in the plot was not seen till 1887. Professor Norwood has followed Verrall by no means slavishly or blindly; in another edition, we hope, he will modify his adhesion at this point. Verrall has probably done more for Aeschylus, to secure his proper place in the study and the affection of those capable of seeing, and to assure sane treatment for his text, than any other scholar since the Renaissance; his interpretation is surpassed in suggestiveness

by none; but his very ingenuity and imagination sometimes vitiated his conclusions. Professor Norwood's criticism of the Choephoroi, though some points might be controverted, is in essence true and useful. The fact, often overlooked, that the Choephoroi has a real and ingenious plot, is clearly shown. The interpretation of the Eumenides is by no means wholly in agreement with Verrall's.

We note with pleasure the recognition that Aeschylus, in the Iphigenia lyric, surpassed Euripides on Euripides's strongest ground. The vast religious superiority of Aeschylus over all other Greeks of his time is asserted, in the chapter on Euripides. A curious comment is this, that Aeschylus "has a strange way of writing Greek at times as if it were some other language". The illustration cited is from the Suppliants, 836—the words of an Egyptian. If there still are persons who believe that Aeschylus made all his characters talk in the grand style, such a passage may to them be unaccountable, and need 'correcting'. But why should not the genius which produced the Watchman's and the Herald's speech in the Agamemnon, and, above all, the Nurse's speech in the Choephoroi, have also here intended to represent a foreigner's effort in Greek? Professor Norwood himself, in speaking of Aeschylus's frequent picturesqueness of characterization, says of this very Egyptian herald, "One seems to see that he is a Negro".

The discussions, in Chapters IV and V, of Sophocles and Euripides seem deserving of unmixed praise. The author may be deemed by some readers one of the last of the Sophocleans of the school of Jebb. Yet, in one note on the Trachiniae, he disagrees with Jebb. The criticism of Sophocles is sound and helpful. It is admitted that one may, in certain moods, read the Oedipus Tyrannus and find it mere frigid eloquence. Sophocles's typical Athenian quality, of which reticence is a marked characteristic, is well explained. His "unearthly splendor" is strongly emphasized. Refreshing is the protest against curtailing the Ajax to conform to modern theories of tragedy. At first, many readers of this chapter may think that they have lost the Antigone; on fuller reflection, they will see that the play emerges all the finer. "It is Antigone's splendid though perverse valor which creates the drama". The discussion of the Oedipus Tyrannus is long and solid, of the Philoctetes brilliant. Yet Oedipus at Colonus is probably Professor Norwood's favorite. On the whole, we believe Chapter IV to be the finest in the book, and well suited to serve as a brief companion to Sophocles.

Chapter V, Euripides, is much the longest. Its very length precludes detailed review. Its length is mainly due to the greater number of the extant plays of Euripides. Euripides is viewed as the poet of the Athenian disillusionment, who ought to be well understood by our own age. His greatness is well set forth, without unfounded claims. The Rhesus, called an "admirable drama", is held to be a genuine, and very early, work of Euripides.

Each of the chapters on the Great Three ends with an unusually full treatment of the fragments of the lost works. Here the late discoveries at Oxyrhyncus are taken into account, and information possessed, not long ago, not even by scholars, is made available to all.

An unusual feature of this book is the brief discussion of meter and rhythm, which forms the sixth, and last, chapter. Beginning at the foundation, the determination of the quantity of syllables, through a good explanation of the simpler meters it proceeds to a treatment of the lyrics, which will be found helpful by actual readers of the tragedies.

Professor Norwood has succeeded in his avowed object. In our judgment, this is the best available single volume in English for "the whole domain of Greek Tragedy". Some of the information herein given will, indeed, not easily be found elsewhere.

D'YONVILLE COLLEGE,
BUFFALO, N. Y.

HENRY S. DAWSON

Musa Americana. Fourth Series. Vicus Desertus (The Deserted Village: by Oliver Goldsmith) in Latin Hexameters, with English Text. By Anthony F. Geyser, S. J. Chicago: Loyola University Press (1920). Pp. 33.

A Latin version of The Deserted Village (430 lines) entails the writing of a Latin poem almost as long as one of Vergil's Georgics. Professor Geyser says in his Foreword (3-4),

To reproduce a long poem of such exquisite beauty in the stern language of the Romans, to translate it line for line, phrase for phrase, in Latin hexameters, true in rhythm, simple in construction, and poetic in diction was the task the Author of Vicus Desertus has proposed to himself. The labor bestowed on Vicus Desertus has been a labor of love which was undertaken from an enthusiastic admiration for Oliver Goldsmith's immortal poem and from a desire to advance the cause of Latin in our country by presenting to the Classical Student a metrical translation of a work of poetry with which he is familiar from his study of English literature.

In order to make it easier for the reader to follow the course of the poet's thought, the poem is broken up into the following sequence: Simplicis Ruris Deliciae (1-34); Vastatio (35-74); Poetae Somnia (75-112); "Quantum Mutatus Ab Illo" (113-136); Parochus (137-192); Ludimagister (193-218); Vici Taberna (219-250); Aurea Mediocritas (251-264); Luxuriae Pericula (265-302); Vae Pauperibus (303-336); Patriae Exsules (337-384); "Auri Sacra Fames" (385-406); Vale (407-430).

The author has defined his task in his Foreword; yet opinions may differ as to whether the elegiac distich would not offer a better vehicle for this beautiful but mannered poem in heroic couplets. The epigrammatic turns, the staccato-like points of the couplets are either lost or obscured by the procession of hexameters, many of them monostichs, of which some, at least, retard the easy flow of verse. On the

other hand, the poem is often 'idyllic', often (in the Roman sense) 'satiric', and for such a content the dactylic hexameter is the conventional dress; yet it might be argued that Roman elegy offers many idyllic and satiric passages.

As an example of the author's manner I may cite the familiar passage (213-216) and its rendering:

While words of learned length and thundering sound
Amazed the gazing rustics ranged around;
And still they gazed, and still the wonder grew,
That one small head could carry all he knew.

Doctae sed voces, longae, tumideque tonantes,
Ruricolae terrent,—arrectis auribus adstant—
Stant stupefacti illi, mirantes plusque magisque
Unum posse caput capere omnia nota magistro.

The space allotted to this review makes it impracticable to include detailed criticism. The version, as a whole, shows certain unevennesses, due, in part, to the fact that *The Deserted Village* is not conceived in the Roman spirit, so that a literal rendering must necessarily produce a different effect. Furthermore, as compared with the English, the Latin version, in spite of its many felicities, lacks the perspicuity, the clear definition, the crispness of phrase, and the easy grace of movement that lend so much charm to the original. The art of the translator requires of him that he conceive and write a poem in the classical manner which in its qualities of sustained beauty and apparent spontaneity will reproduce the effect of the original. There is perhaps in this theory a counsel of perfection, but it does not prevent a poet from developing a style of his own. Latin words with their colorful memories of Vergil, Ovid, Horace, and Juvenal can easily lend themselves to new kaleidoscopic groupings. The Neo-Latin poet need not borrow purple patches, but the classic manner must be consistent and sustained. It is one of the charms of the *Eclogues* of Mantuan that he so easily creates this illusion. And so, for example, Melander's Greek versions of Catullus help show the affinity between the Greek and the Roman lyric spirit.

If the making of Latin versions is to be considered as merely individual experimentation in the artistic use of words and meters, the result may be judged, as in an exercise, on the lower ground of Latinity and form. But, if the aim is higher, there is wide scope for originality, ingenuity, poetic insight, imagination, and technical skill. Having a real facility for Latin verse-writing, Father Geyser should adhere more rigidly to the classic norms of diction and syntax. Whatever the exigencies of translation, the versifier must exercise his ingenuity in avoiding usages from the *sermo pedestris*.

Just a few verbal criticisms may be noted. *Antea* (359) is not a dactyl. *Ludimagister* (196) begins with a spondee (the verse could be rewritten thus: *haud multos docuit turbae ludique magister*). *Rurestres* (398) is postclassical; *singulo* . . . *gradu* (353) is early and late colloquial. *Valore* (426) is a very rare, late word; why not write, for *praeexcellere posse valore*, *virtute excellere posse*? Free uses of the infinitive, such as *ut moveat* . . . *tentare* (168), *ducit* . . . *depascere*

(306), *facit omnia luce nitere* (178), even when rare usage may confirm them, should be avoided. And, lastly, the best writers avoid such verse-openings as *ignibus assidet et* (156), *singula iugera cum* (58), *gaudia simplicia haec* (252). Moreover, a feminine caesura in the fourth foot, *prohibere quiete senili* (88), *redimire quiete senili* (100), is to be avoided.

UNION COLLEGE

GEORGE DWIGHT KELLOGG

Res Metrica. An Introduction to the Study of Greek and Roman Versification. By the late William Ross Hardie. Oxford; at the Clarendon Press (1920). Pp. xii + 275.

Part I (1-117) describes the heroic hexameter, the elegiac couplet, anapaests, iambic verse, the scazon, the trochaic tetrameter and hendecasyllabics; Part II (119-260) deals with Greek lyric verse, the history of meter at Rome, and the lyric meter of Horace. An Appendix (261-275) contains a glossary of some metrical terms and a chronological table.

The author regarded his work as a text-book designed to serve as an introduction to the subject. He made no "attempt at deductive, exhaustive, and systematic exposition" (vi), but aimed rather to remain as far as possible on firm ground, relegating controversial matter as a rule to an excursus. It was a further aim to handle meter in an historical way and so link it closely with literary study, the chronological table being intended to further this purpose. Metrical terms are defined, not in the text, but in a glossary (unfortunately not complete). We are informed that the chapters of the work were written at different times, some of them being regarded at first as private experiments and not material for publication. This method of composition, as might be expected, resulted in some repetitions and omissions. It is unfortunate that the book lacks an Index.

The heroic hexameter is treated along both Homeric and Vergilian lines, the main characteristics of the verse being brought out by analysis and comparison. A touchstone of correct method on the part of a metrist is the habit of distinguishing clearly between diaeresis or caesura as they ordinarily occur and the same elements as modified by proclisis or enclisis. The author's practice here is excellent. For example, in the line, *πολλὰ δ' ἄντα κάτ' ἄντα πᾶρ' ἄντα τε δοχμαῖ τ' ἔλθον*, he holds (21) that in effect there is no 'trochaic' division in the fourth foot. Parallel cases in Latin are not so apparent to the eye, owing to the absence of a written accent, but to the ear, which is the final test, they are not less real. Again, he criticizes (27) certain statistics given by Norden in which a verse like *fataque fortunasque virum moresque manusque* is classed as having a main caesura in the middle of the third foot. Along somewhat similar lines the author seems to be justified (15) in disagreeing with Gleditsch, *Metrik*, 119, when the latter, following Hartel, asserts that sixty per cent. of Homer's lines have bucolic division, such division being recognized in verses ending thus: *ἐλώρια τεύχε κόνεσσιν*.

On this principle, *atque altae moenia Romae* would be a bucolic ending in Latin, and Catullus's 'Peleus and Thetis' would be one of the most bucolic poems in the Latin language. . . . Lines in Homer in which a bucolic diaeresis attracts the reader's attention are not very frequent; lines which have any real claim to be 'bucolic' are not more than half as numerous as Hartel makes them.

Inasmuch as the book was intended for 'beginners', it is difficult to see why the author dwelt at some length on a certain puzzling theory (the authority of which is not cited) that the sixth foot of the verse of Homer is not a spondee, but a dactyl in catalectic form.

The chapter on anapaestic rhythm contains the following observation (58):

. . . it seems clear that it is and was distinctly felt to be an 'ascending' rhythm; we must not follow J. H. H. Schmidt in applying to it the methods of modern music and scanning anapaests as dactyls with anacrusis. . . . The name ἀνάσταντος implies this, and it is confirmed by the regularity with which a word ends with the end of the second foot. . . . The same question has been raised about iambic verse, which Schmidt treated as trochaic with anacrusis. About both the testimony of antiquity is that the rising movement gave an effect of greater vigor and energy—the downward dactylic and trochaic movements one of greater fluency and facility—and in the case of iambi Quintilian expressly says that this effect was felt throughout the line. . . . In a hexameter and iambic trimeter the rhythm may be said to be reversed at the *caesura*; in an anapaestic dimeter the initial effect was definitely repeated or renewed in the middle of the line. . . .

The term iambic trimeter "designates a handling of the metre that was distinctively Greek, though practised also by later Roman poets"; the senarius was a "heavier and more amorphous type of line which prevailed at Rome before the Augustan Age" (68). Both types of verse are described, including such features as resolution and substitution. Attention is given to the "Lex Porsoni" and to K. Witte's suggestions (Hermes, 1904, 229) as to the underlying cause of the law. The author follows similar traditional lines in discussing the iambic tetrameter catalectic and the scazon. The same may be said concerning the usual types of trochaic verse. The hendecasyllabic verse in its Greek form is represented as beginning with a dissyllabic 'Aeolic basis' which is followed by a dactyl and three trochees. The author presents also Varro's interpretation of the verse as an ionic trimeter, but does not think it was commonly so read in classical times. He likewise tells the reader of the theory that the verse began with a dactylic and ended with an iambic penthemimeres. It is not necessary for the author to refute ancient theories that conflict with his own, for he sets out in this book "to inquire what is the best way of describing verse-forms rather than what is the way supported by tradition" (page x). Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, in his recent *Griechische Verskunst*, we may add, takes a somewhat similar position (59):

'It would have been convenient, if ancient metrical theory could have guided us, but this theory was not developed till classical poetry was already at hand. Moreover, what we know of it is derived from quite late School manuals, whose inadequacy is betrayed on

all hands. So we shall really get from this theory only additional data and a means of strengthening our powers of observation. The theoretical propositions will not bind us until we have found out by reference to the verses how far they are valid. We must deduce Greek metric for ourselves as we have deduced Greek grammar from surviving literary monuments'.

Part II takes up at the outset certain lyric forms used by Archilochus, Alcman, and Sappho. They are described preferably in terms of dactyls and trochees, though the quadrisyllabic scansion is also indicated. A recently recovered poem of Sappho supplies the author with a characteristic argument: each stanza consists of two Glyconics and a line differing from a Glyconic only in having an additional dactyl. Moreover, the author finds a case of syllabic shortening which is paralleled in Homer's dactylic verse. Again, both Sappho and Alcaeus recall Homeric events and phraseology. But the exponents of the rival method of analysis find that certain verses are derived from others by adding or subtracting quadrisyllabic units (e. g. in the case of Asclepiadean verses). So the argument is not conclusive. The author believes (135) that the method of analysis followed by him will enable a modern reader to find it <the verse> pleasing. . . . We must be careful not to make some of the greatest poetry of the Greeks difficult, or even repellent, for the literary student, in obedience to what may be only a dubious and ingenious theory.

Res Metrica was prepared confessedly for 'beginners'. But the structure of certain lyric forms is presented in a manner that would be difficult for a beginner to grasp (e. g. the Alcaic stanza, page 245, and the location of triseme syllables in Pindar's verse). However, from the standpoint of scholars and advanced students the book is both interesting and illuminating.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LEON J. RICHARDSON

THE CORPUS SCRIPTORUM CLASSICORUM PARAVIANUM

As everyone knows, Germany has long had an authoritative series of texts of the classical authors, both Greek and Latin—the famous Teubner Series. Some twenty-five years ago, the Oxford University Press began the publication of the Oxford Classical Texts, a series which by this time has grown to goodly proportions, containing a fair array of authors, both Greek and Latin. In *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 11.200, I called attention to a New Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum—the Corpus Scriptorum Classicorum Paravianum, under the general editorship of Professor Carlo Pascal, of the University of Pavia. The series was started during the Great War, in protest against the dependence of Italian classical scholarship on Germany. It was explained in that notice that the Corpus gets its name from the publishers—I. V. Paravia and Company, a firm which seems to have branch offices in Turin, Rome, Florence, Naples, and Palermo. It may be worth while to put together here as complete a list as I can of the volumes of this Corpus thus far issued (matter enclosed between parentheses gives the contents of one volume):

Caesar, *De Bello Civili*, by Dominico Bassi; Caesar, *De Bello Gallico*, by Dominico Bassi; Carminum Ludicra Romanorum (= Pervigilium Veneris, De Rosis Nascentibus, Priapeorum Libellus), by Carlo Pascal; Catullus, by Carlo Pascal; Cicero, Cato Maior, by

Umberto Moricca; Cicero, *In Catilinam*, by Sixto Colombo; Cicero, *De Re Publica*, by Carlo Pascal and Iohannes Galbiati; Cicero (*Pro Milone*, *Pro Archia*, with certain scholia on these orations), by Sixto Colombo; Cicero (*Pro Sexto Roscio Amerino*, *De Imperio Cn. Pompeii*), by S. Colombo; Cicero, *Laelius*, by Egnatius Bassi; *Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti Operum Fragmenta*, by H. Malcovati; *Martial*, in three volumes, by Caesar Giarratano; *Minucius Felix*, *Octavius*, by A. Valmaggi; *Ovid*, *Tristia*, by Carlo Landi; *Ovid*, *Ars Amatoria*, by C. Marchesi; *Ovid*, *Metamorphoses*, 1-4, by Paolo Fabbri; *Persius*, by Felix Ramorino; *Phaedrus*, by D. Bassi; *Plautus*, *Stichus*, by C. O. Zuretti; *Plautus*, *Captivi*, by Carlo Pascal; *Plautus*, *Miles Gloriosus*, by C. O. Zuretti; *Seneca* (*Thyestes*, *Phaedra*), by Umberto Moricca; *Seneca*, *De Ira*, by A. Barriera; *Tacitus*, *Germania*, by Caesar Annibaldi and Carlo Pascal; *Tacitus*, *Dialogus*, by F. C. Wick; *Tacitus*, *Historiae* 1-2, by M. Lenchantin de Gubernatis; *Vergil*, *Georgics*, by R. Sabbadini; *Vergil*, *Aeneid*, 4 volumes, by R. Sabbadini; *Vergil* (*Eclogues*, *Moretum*, *Copa*), by Carlo Pascal; *Vergil* (*Catalepton*, *Maecenas*, *Priapeum*), by R. Sabbadini.

Each volume contains an Appendix Critica. As explained in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 11.200, these are conservative editions, a sharp reaction against the practice of some, at least, of the editors of the Teubner text. The editors admit conjectures only where the MSS give no sense at all. The booklets are therefore a very welcome addition to the scholar's apparatus.

It will be noted that the volumes in each case are small. As a result, they are handy and cheap (they ranged, at first, from Lire 1.25 to Lire 5. Of the more recent volumes some are priced as high as 12 Lire; at present rates of exchange this is about fifty to sixty cents). When times become normal again, and the importation of books from abroad shall be once more easy, no doubt scholars will make frequent use of this series. They also form very convenient, and, the quality of the paper aside, very attractive texts in which to read and reread a favorite author.

Reference may be made here to a review, by Professor B. L. Ullman, of the volume containing Catullus (see *Classical Philology* 15.210-211). In *The Classical Review* 32. 123-125, there were notices of the volumes containing the *Bucolics*, the *Stichus*, the *Captivi*, the *Catalepton*, by W. M. Lindsay; of those containing the *Tristia* and the *Ars Amatoria*, by E. H. Alton; of those containing the *De Re Publica* and the *Pro Milone*, by A. C. Clark; of the volume containing the *De Bello Civili*, by A. G. Peskett (adverse). The editions of the *Dialogus*, the *Agricola*, and the *Germania* of Tacitus were favorably reviewed by Professor J. Wight Duff in *The Classical Review* 33.158-160.

The Italians deserve the highest praise for starting such a series in a time so distressing as the days of the Great War. In fairer times such blemishes as marked the first volumes will, no doubt, disappear.

C. K.

A NEW FRENCH SERIES OF CLASSICAL TEXTS

Within the last two or three years French scholars have definitely set about the preparation of a series of texts of authors, Greek and Latin, for themselves. The preparation of this series is under the direction of an association known as *The Association Guillaume Budé*. This Society, which includes all the great French philologists, was founded during the Great War, under the Presidency of M. Maurice Croizet, a member of the Institute, and Professor in the Collège de France. The Association derives its name from Guillaume Budé, the greatest humanist of the French Renaissance, the founder of the Collège de France.

The first purpose of the Association is to publish a collection of the principal Greek and Latin works,

about three hundred in number, to be known officially as "Collection des Universités de France publiée, sous le patronage de l'Association Guillaume Budé", apparently, in each instance, in three different ways—text and translation, text alone, and translation alone. The prospectus states that, in undertaking this modern series of Greek and Latin texts, French scholars are seeking to free France 'from the tribute paid for years by her students and her scholars to the German booksellers'. The series, then, will match the *Corpus Scriptorum Classicorum Paravianum* (see *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 15.135-136).

In addition to the texts proper, the Association plans to issue, in time, commentaries on all the important authors; a series of minor texts, especially works of technical content; and volumes of literary and historical studies. Under the last head a beginning has been made, in the publication of a volume entitled *Histoire de la Littérature Chrétienne*, by Pierre De Labriolle.

Foreigners may join the Association (dues for annual members, 10 francs). Members receive the publications of the Association up to the value of the annual subscription, and, besides, enjoy a discount of 25% on whatever other publications of the Association they buy. The office of the Association Guillaume Budé is 157 Boulevard Saint Germain, Paris.

The following volumes at least have been published: *Aeschylus*, *Tome I*, by Paul Mazon, of the University of Paris, containing the text and translation of the *Supplices*, the *Persae*, the *Septem Contra Thebas*, and the *Prometheus Vincit*; *Cicero*, *Tome I*, by H. De La Ville De Mirmont, of the University of Bordeaux, containing *Pro Quinctio*, *Pro S. Roscio Amerino*, and *Pro Q. Roscio Comoedo*; *Lucretius*, two volumes, by Alfred Ernout, of the University of Lille; *Persius*, *A. Cartault*, of the University of Paris; *Plato*, *Tome I*, by Maurice Croizet, of the Collège De France, containing *Hippias Minor*, *Alcibiades*, *Apology*, *Euthyphro*, and *Crito*; *Theophrastus*, *Characteres*, by Octave Navarre, of the University of Toulouse; *Juvenal*, by MM. De Labriolle et Villeneuve (Universities of Poitiers and Aix). Each volume contains a Preface or Introduction, discussing the author and his work, and an indication of the manuscript material employed. The translation is printed on the left hand pages, the text on the right; the *Apparatus Criticus* is brief. For both translation and text fine fonts of type are used, especially for the Greek. The large pages of Latin and Greek present a fine, open appearance.

Two reviews of the *Lucretius* are known to me, one by Professor G. J. Laing, in *The Classical Journal* 16.168-169, the other by W. M. Lindsay, *The Classical Review* 35.29-30.

C. K.

PEGASUS AS THE POET'S STEED

As a supplement to my note on Pegasus, *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 14.200, I may add a couple of references to the Italian romantic epic.

In the thirty-sixth canto of *Curtio Gonzaga's Il Fido Amante* the hero of the poem is permitted by Apollo to mount Pegasus and make a survey of the universe. This epic was printed at Venice in 1591.

At the close of the sixth canto of the *Ricciardetto* of Niccolò Fortiguerra ('*Carteromaco*') the poet pauses in his song to hunt up more hay for his winged steed:

E mentre il fieno
Al caval Pegasèo cerco, e proveggio,
Perchè batta col piè l'arso terreno,
E mi secondi a cantar altre cose;
Vado lungi da voi, donne amoroze.

This poem was begun in 1716.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

W. P. MUSTARD